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The Problem

**Single Source Shortest Paths (SSSP)** Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with non-negative edge weights and a starting vertex $v_0$, find the shortest path from $v_0$ to every $v \in V$.

Some Definitions:

- The *weight* of a path is the sum of the weights of the edges along that path.
- The *length* of a path is the number of edges along the path.
- A “shortest path” from $v_0$ is the *minimum weight path* from $v_0$.
- The *distance* from $v_0$ to $v$, $v.\text{dist}$, is the sum of the weights on the minimum weight path from $v_0$ to $v$. 
Dijkstra’s Algorithm

Use a priority queue keyed on distance.

1. Set \( v_0.\text{dist} = 0 \) and \( v.\text{dist} = \infty \) for all \( v \neq v_0 \).
2. Create priority queue \( Q \) on all vertices in \( V \).
3. While \( Q \) is not empty:
   3.1 \( v = \text{Extract-Min}(Q) \)
   3.2 For all \( u \) such that \((v, u) \in E\)
      3.2.1 \( u.\text{dist} = v.\text{dist} + w(v, u) \), where \( w(v, u) \) is the weight of edge \((v, u)\).
      3.2.2 \( \text{Decrease-Key}(Q, u, u.\text{dist}) \)

Running Time: \( O(E \cdot T_{\text{Decrease-Key}} + V \cdot T_{\text{Extract-Min}}) \).

Can we parallelize Dijkstra’s Algorithm?

- Priority queue is a serial bottleneck.
- Only definitely useful operation is to process the minimum element of priority queue at each step.
Gabow’s Scaling Algorithm

**Idea:** Consider the edge weights one bit at a time.

- The weight of the minimum weight path from \( v_0 \) to \( v \) using just the most significant bit of the weight is an approximation for the weight of the minimum weight path from \( v_0 \) to \( v \).
- Incrementally introduce additional bits of the weight to refine our approximation of the minimum weight paths.
- Once all of the bits of the weights are considered, we’re done.
Gabow’s Scaling Algorithm

- At each iteration, for some edge \((u, v)\) we define the difference in approximate distances \(u.\text{dist} - v.\text{dist}\) to be the potential across \((u, v)\).

- We define the cost of an edge to be its refined weight at some iteration plus the potential across it:
  \[ l_i(u, v) = w_i(u, v) + u.\text{dist} - v.\text{dist}. \]

- Since the sum of costs along a path telescopes, these costs preserve the minimum weight paths in the graph.

- We guarantee that the cost of an edge is always nonnegative.

- \(\Rightarrow\) We can repeatedly find minimum weight paths on graphs of cost values.
Optimizing Gabow

We can restrict the size of the priority queue used on each step.

- The length of a path with \( p \) edges can increase by at most \( p \) on each subsequent iteration of Gabow.
- Let \( p_{i,\text{max}} \) be the length of the longest minimum weight path after the \( i \)th iteration of Gabow.
- The sum of the costs on a minimum weight path during the \( i + 1 \)st iteration can be no more than \( p_{i,\text{max}} \).
- The \( i \)th iteration of Gabow can find the minimum weight paths using a monotone priority queue with only \( p_{i-1,\text{max}} \) bins.
Parallelizing Gabow

Can we do it?

- The priority queue must store $V$ items in $p_{i,\text{max}}$ bins.
- $p_{i,\text{max}} \leq V$, but we expect $p_{i,\text{max}} < V$ in many cases.
- $\Rightarrow$ We expect bins to contain multiple items.
- We can process the contents of each bin in parallel.
Issues with parallelizing Gabow:

- Parallel threads will try to set the distance for a vertex simultaneously. We want the minimum distance to win.
- Parallel threads will be adding vertices to a priority queue in parallel. We want the priority queue to work properly anyway.
- A vertex may have many neighbors connected with zero-length edges. We need to manage these neighbors efficiently.
Parallelizing Gabow

Race condition for distance value: “Double-setting”

- Let the race be.
- When removing a vertex from its minimum bin in the priority queue, ensure its distance value is correct before proceeding.
- At the point when a vertex is removed from its minimum bin, we know its correct distance.
- $\Rightarrow$ The non-benign race becomes benign.
Parallel priority queue:

- Don’t use a **Decrease-Key** operation; just **Insert**.
- When we encounter a vertex we have evaluated already, skip it.
- Currently, we used a locked data structure for each bin to resolve a race for inserting into the same bin.
- Alternatively, use TLS for each bin to remove contention on writing to the same bin.
- Parallel threads can insert into the queue with no contention.
Parallelizing Gabow

Zero-weight edges:
- Keep two buffers for each bin. Fill the second while processing the first.
- Once the first is done, if the second is non-empty, swap the buffers and repeat.
- If the second buffer gets sufficiently large, spawn off a separate thread to process it.
Theoretical Performance of Gabow

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple connected weighted directed graph. Let $W$ be the maximum edge weight in $G$. Let $\Delta$ be the maximum out-degree of a vertex $v \in V$.

- Work: $\Theta(E \lg W)$.
- Span: $O(V \lg W \lg \Delta)$ worst-case.
  - Bits of weight are processed serially in phases. $\Theta(\lg W)$
  - Within each phase, each bin in the priority queue is processed serially.
  - Within a bin, the longest chain of vertices connected by zero-weight edges is processed serially.
  - Edges on minimum weight paths from previous phase may have weight of 0 or 1.
  - In the worst case, every vertex appears in some bin’s longest chain of zero-weight edges once.
  - Total length of zero-weight edge chains in all bins is $O(V)$ worst case.
  - Each vertex has $\Delta$ neighbors to explore, which requires $O(\lg \Delta)$ span.
Theoretical Performance of Gabow

Suppose we have random edge weights, and let $D$ be the length of the longest minimum weight path in any phase of Gabow.

- Work: $\Theta(E \lg W)$.
- Span: $O(D \lg W \lg \Delta \lg V / D)$
  - Each phase must examine $D$ bins serially.
  - The length of the longest zero-weight edge chain in a bin is $O(\lg V / D)$ with high probability.
  - Total length of zero-weight edge chains in all bins is $O(D \lg V / D)$.
- $\Omega(E / V \lg \Delta)$ parallelism worst-case.
- $\Omega(E / (D \lg \Delta \lg V / D))$ parallelism with random edge weights.
Empirical Performance of Gabow

We tested our parallel Gabow implementation on a few input graphs, including the New York and San Francisco Bay road networks.

- First, we collected metrics on the priority queue data structure during Gabow’s execution, including Bin size, Queue size, and longest zero-weight edge chain.
- Second, we compared Gabow’s serial and parallel performance to a simple Dijkstra implementation.

The data presented here comes from running Gabow on the San Francisco Bay road network. \( V = 321270, E = 800172 \). Parallelism according to Cilkview: 4.76 (2.29 burdened)
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Number of Evaluated Vertices in Each Bin (San Francisco Bay road network)
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Number of Ignored Vertices in Each Bin (San Francisco Bay road network)
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Maximum Length of Zero-Weight Edge Chain (San Francisco Bay road network)
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Queue Size (San Francisco Bay road network):

Min 523
Median 1026
Mean 20119
Max 321270 = V
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Performance on San Francisco Bay road network:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dijkstra (ms)</th>
<th>Gabow, 1 proc (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>5116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing speedup and trials with parallelism and burdened speedup.](image-url)
Future Work

- Remove lingering unnecessary serial code in parallel Gabow implementation.
- Use TLS for each bin in the priority queue, rather than a locked vector, to remove lingering contention.
- Investigate memory bandwidth issues.
- Experiment with alternative graph layouts.
Empirical Performance of Gabow as of 05-10-2010

Performance on random graph, $V = 1.5M, E = 4M$
Empirical Performance of Gabow as of 05-10-2010

Performance on road network for northeastern U.S.

![Graph showing performance on road network for northeastern U.S.](image-url)